

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

605 VAN NESS AVENUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

July 7, 2020

Agenda ID #18604
Quasi-Legislative

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 18-12-005:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Brian R. Stevens and ALJ Marcelo L. Poirier. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's August 6, 2020 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Comments must be filed, pursuant to Rule 1.13, either electronically or in hard copy. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Stevens at brc@cpuc.ca.gov and to the Intervenor Compensation Program at icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ ANNE E. SIMON

Anne E. Simon

Chief Administrative Law Judge

AES:nd3

Attachment

BRC/MPO/nd3

PROPOSED DECISION**Agenda ID #18604 [\(Rev.1\)](#)****[Quasi-Legislative](#)****[8/6/2020 Item #27](#)**

Decision PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ STEVENS AND ALJ POIRIER
 (Mailed 7/7/2020)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Examine
 Electric Utility De-Energization of Power
 Lines in Dangerous Conditions.

Rulemaking 18-12-005

DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO WILLIAM B. ABRAMS FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 19-05-042

Intervenor: William B. Abrams	For contribution to Decision (D.) 19-05-042
Claimed: \$69,260	Awarded: \$36,890.00 (reduced by 46.7%)
Assigned Commissioner: Marybel Batjer	Assigned ALJs: Brian Stevens and Marcelo Poirier

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	This decision adopts de-energization (Public Safety Power Shut-off) communication and notification guidelines for the electric investor-owned utilities along with updates to the requirements established in Resolution ESRB-8. The guidelines adopted in this decision are meant to expand upon those in Resolution ESRB-8. Resolution ESRB-8 and the guidelines adopted in this decision remain in effect unless and until superseded by a subsequent decision. This decision also presents the overarching de-energization strategy of the Commission.
--	--

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	2/19/2019	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	3/4/2019	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.18-12-005	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:		
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Supplement to NOI filed on 6/17/19 but no ruling issued	The ruling on the supplement to the NOI is rendered in this decision.
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status?		Yes. See Part I(C)(5-8), below
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.18-12-005	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		May 21, 2019 and this decision
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Filed Under Seal on 7/29/19 awaiting determination	See, Part I(C)(9-12), below
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes. See Part I(C)(9-12), below.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.19-05-042	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	6/4/19 (earliest issuance date)	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	8/5/2019	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
5-8		On June 17, 2019, Mr. Abrams filed a supplement to his notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation. The supplement provided, in response to the Ruling of May 21, 2019, a copy of his energy statement. This document supports Mr. Abrams's eligibility to claim intervenor compensation as an individual ratepayer (see Section 1802(b)(1)(A) and D.98-04-059 at 30).
9-12		On August 5, 2019, Mr. Abrams filed his personal financial information, in response to the Ruling of May 21, 2019. Financial documents submitted by Mr. Abrams demonstrate that he "cannot afford, without undue hardship, to pay the costs of effective participation." The standard of significant financial hardship in Section 1802(h) has been met.
1	I have 20 plus years of related experience and provided my resume with my notice for R.18-12-005 submitted on 7/29/19.	Noted.
2	I am a wildfire survivor and a professional providing direct subject matter expertise to these proceeding with a specific focus on strategic planning, quality assurance, metrics, safety and risk analysis. My personal and professional experience relative to this proceeding provides me with a unique and value-added perspective.	Noted
3	I attended prehearing conference, voting meetings, workshops and provided detailed guidance and recommendations including but not limited to Comment on 3/25/19, Reply Comments on 4/4, Comments on PD 5/17/19)	Noted

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059):**

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
I am presenting my substantial contributions to this proceeding and to this decision in reverse chronological order (most recent first) in which the positions were presented:		
1. I provided detailed analysis and recommendations for more clearly defining "last resort" as a science-based threshold. (Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams also suggests that utility de-energization events be measured against other actions taken to reduce risk, showing that de-energization is a measure of last resort." (D.19-05-042, pg. 62, 66, 67)	Verified
2. I advocated and provided specific standardized thresholds across utilities to ensure greater accountability for de-energization tasks and deliverables. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams supports standardization of thresholds across the utilities." (D.19-05-042, pg. 39)	Verified
3. I provided recommendations for standardizing re-energization associated with these IOU practices and procedures. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 24, 31, 34, 66, 69, 71-72, 84, 86, 96)	Verified
4. I provided specific recommendations and methodology for building in performance-based metrics and specific communication vehicles into the communication strategy and outlined MARCOM analytical tools for gauging customer awareness. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Metrics to gauge whether public education and outreach efforts are effective." (D.19-05-042, pg. B-4)	Verified
5. I was the only party to point out that PG&E is currently out of compliance with the orders in the PD due to their stated lack	My motions were filed in R.18.10.007 but I made sure to file associated with	This proceeding is not a compliance proceeding, but a

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
of performance in the Second Amendment filed in association with R.18.10.007. Patrol of all lines prior to re-energization, reclosers and other requirements were not achieved relative to de-energization. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19)	this proceeding given that the PG&E filed comments after parties had a chance to respond. This PG&E filing will impact phase 2 of this proceeding.	rulemaking, thus not a substantive contribution to this proceeding.
6. I was the only party to specifically advocate and provide specific recommendations around communications/alerts for re-energization. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 6, 26, 34, 36-38, 42-46, 48-53, 66-68, 90, 94-95, 97)	Verified
7. I provided recommendations regarding additional regulatory reporting when de-energization notifications were not provided by an IOU. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 102-105, 111, 118-119, 125, A21-A24, B1)	Verified
8. I outlined and provided recommendations to ensure that equity is a central objective of any de-energization plan given that electric generation and distribution during a de-energization event is cost-prohibitive for many low-income ratepayers. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 25-41, 44, 74)	Verified
9. I provided specific recommendations to ensure that the "prudent manager" standard applied to de-energization events including supporting ratepayers with generation and distribution of power during these PSPS events. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 39, 78, A-12, B-4)	Verified
10. I provided specific proposals for reporting relative to de-energization so that improvements to de-energization plans and Continuous Improvement Processes (CIP) would be built into the regulatory processes. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams emphasizes the importance of advance notification so that affected entities are prepared when a de-energization event is called." (D.19-05-042, pg. 36)	Verified
11. I recommended that a database be required to actively manage Points of	(D.19-05-042, pg. 45-48)	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
Contact for First Responders and other critical infrastructure acutely impacted by de-energization events. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19)		
12. I recommended that utilities be the sole responsible owner of communications around de-energization so there is not a diffusion of responsibility. I also provided a methodology for establishing clear lines of communications with other stakeholders. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 43-44)	Verified
13. While other parties argued that redundancy in communications around de-energization should be avoided, I asserted that redundant communications are a strategic part of any solid notification/communication plan but needed to be deliberate and strategic. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 57, 96-97)	Verified
14. I provided guidance that Single Points of Contact (SPOCs) for emergencies should be updated quarterly by IOUs and/or as near to real-time as possible. (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 50, 76, 117, 120, A-10, A-11, A-13)	Verified
15. I argued that ESRB-8 should be considered as part of this phase of the proceeding as it will better prepare us for upcoming wildfire season including reporting requirements. (WBA Reply Comments 4/4/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 78, 102-107)	Verified
16. I provided rationale as to why there needed to be stronger definition of terms like "strong wind event", "polygon boundaries" and "an extreme hazard" as unless these terms are defined they are too loose and not regulatable as a basis for when de-energization could occur. (WBA Reply Comments 4/4/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"MWDOC, Abrams, the Joint Local Governments, NCPA and CCSF agree that the utilities should have clearly articulated thresholds and conditions." (D.19-05-042, pg. 39)	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
17. I provided specific recommendations regarding how to improve "timelines" with actual numerical times so they can be tracked including Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and Key Performance Indices (KPIs) so they can be regulated and serve as criteria for de-energization actions. (WBA Reply Comments 4/4/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Both Abrams and SBUA emphasize coordinated education campaigns in advance of wildfire season." (D.19-05-042, pg. 48) (D.19-050042, pg. 105, 111, pg. 113-115, 119)	Verified
18. I provided specific areas where the communication plans of the IOUs around de-energization needed to be improved including more definition around who, when and how stakeholders could delay de-energization and re-energization events. (WBA Reply Comments 4/4/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 48, 54-56, 100-101, A-25)	Verified
19. I was the only party to call for specific measurable communication objectives around de-energization including but not limited to specific actions ratepayers should take during de-energization events. (WBA Reply Comments 4/4/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"In making a determination of reasonableness, Abrams offers that the Commission should review utility actions for results. For example, Abrams argues utility notifications alone should not be a measure of reasonableness; rather, the Commission must evaluate whether the communications were effective." (D.19-05-042, pg. 62)	Verified
20. I recommended specific communication tools for gauging the relative success of de-energization communications including pre/post-tests, focus groups, surveys, online metrics and other common tools. (WBA Reply Comments 4/4/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams suggests that surveys must be used to determine the effectiveness of education campaigns." (D.19-05-042, pg. 48)	Verified
21. I provided specific measures that should be used to determine when a de-energization event should be considered	(D.19-05-042, pg. B-2)	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
a last resort including the Beaufort Wind Force Scale, dew-point temperature (TDP, TFP) and Vegetation Dryness (TVMDI). (WBA Comments on PD 5/17/19, WBA Reply Comments 4/4/19, WBA Comments 3/25/19)		
22. I was the only party to propose mutual assistance agreements across IOUs to implement best-practices around alert/warning during de-energization events and provided specific communication alert technologies that could be deployed. (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 26, 37-38, 42-43, 46, 48-50, 90, 94, A-1, A-15, A-18-A19, B-3)	Verified
23. I provide a list of specific topics to be included in de-energization communications including power generation, power distribution, mobility and emergency contacts. (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams focuses mostly on advanced education and notes that information should be provided about safe use of generators, traffic safety when traffic signals may be impacted, information regarding where to obtain information, and who to contact during a de-energization event." (D.19-05-042, pg. 41)	Verified
24. As a former CEO of organizations serving individuals with disabilities, I provided specific recommendations around how to broaden and segment communications for "vulnerable populations" based upon "communication mode" and mobility challenges (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams suggests that the term 'vulnerable populations' be replaced with the term 'disproportionately vulnerable populations,' because all residents are vulnerable to utility ignited wildfires." (D.19-05-042, pg. 27)	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
25. As a former implementation manager for alert/warning devices, I was able to recommend specific criteria for de-energization alert/warning including leveraging existing mobile alerting systems. (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 49-50)	Verified
26. I was the only party that recommended that facilities that have Flammable and Combustible Material Storage should be on the list of "critical facilities". (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams recommends expansion to include individual decision makers within the private and non-profit sectors that manage at-risk infrastructure, e.g. flammable and combustible material storage facilities." (D.19-05-042, pg. 18). "Abrams supports the inclusion of flammable and combustible material storage facilities." (D.19-05-042, pg. 22)	Verified
27. I made specific recommendations for decision trees and process flows to ensure that coordination among first responders and other stakeholders is managed effectively during de-energization events. (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams asserts that structures and practices for coordination should be developed from a very specific set of protocols with associated communication tools and templates." (D.19-05-042, pg. 52)	Verified
28. I provided specific recommendations for the IOU	"Most parties that responded to Issue 3(a)	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
participation at Emergency Operations Centers (EOCs) to include task-oriented specificity and role definition to ensure value add during emergency situations. (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	support the notion of embedding a utility liaison with decision-making authority in the local jurisdictional emergency operation centers (EOCs), including the Joint Local Governments, OSA, TURN and Abrams." (D.19-05-042, pg. 53)	
29. I provided specific reporting requirements around de-energization events and examples of scorecards and other tools that could be leveraged. (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	(D.19-05-042, pg. 59-63, 102-105)	Verified
30. I provided specific recommendations regarding how the "last resort" standard could be evaluated and justified by evaluating other mitigation tactics deployed by the utility. (WBA Comments 3/25/19)	"Abrams also suggests that utility de-energization events be measured against other actions taken to reduce risk, showing that de-energization is a measure of last resort." (D.19-05-042, pg. 62)	Verified

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?²	Yes	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	No (no other individuals or wildfire survivors) and no other parties with my pertinent professional background	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties:		At various points, Mr. Abrams advocated for position similar to numerous parties, including MWDOC, Joint Local Governments, NCPA, TURN, SBUA, OSA and CCSF.
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: As a wildfire survivor and as the only individual that is a party to the proceeding, I brought a unique perspective to these decisions. Given this unique role, it was important that I provided an understanding of the on-the-ground implications de-energization events. Additionally, my professional background implementing alert/warning solutions in the public sector (Police, Fire, EMS) as well as strategy and analytics experience in many adjacent industries including tech, telecom and nonprofit provided me a unique professional perspective.		While we find some overlap with other parties, that duplication is not significant enough to penalize, especially given the tight deadlines Mr. Abrams references.

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
	Attended Prehearing Conference on February 19, 2019	Verified
	Attended and actively participated in this proceeding including attending meetings with other parties, commission voting meetings relative to the proceeding.	Verified

² The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>My request for intervenor compensation is based upon the unique perspective and professional background I bring to these proceedings. While other parties have focused on cost to ratepayers, legal requirements and other important issues, I have first and foremost focused on wildfire prevention and preparedness as it relates to de-energization and re-energization operations and communications. As a wildfire survivor, I bring a sense of urgency and focus on these issues that is unique given my personal experience with the Northern California wildfires of October, 2017. Since the fires, I have been actively working within wildfire survivor groups and nonprofit organizations locally and at the state-level to impact community adaptation given the increasing threats of wildfires within Sonoma County and across our state.</p> <p>As a professional who has worked for 20 plus years within many of the private industries and social service areas impacted by this proceeding, I also bring a unique perspective and a unique ability to focus on strategy and outcomes relative to the de-energization tactics and associated communication plans proposed by the IOUs. I believe my work associated with this proceeding has provided specific and practical recommendations regarding how to support utility interests, ratepayers and first responders that will need to manage during these events. As a management and analytics professional that has been at the intersection of nonprofit and business, I have looked for solutions that are a win-win for all stakeholders. I have advocated for methodologies and regulatory tools that can improve the “last resort” determination, communications and operations during de-energization events.</p> <p>The aggressive timeline associated with this proceeding has meant that I have had to put other professional and personal endeavors on hold. I have had to turn down other clients and forgo other compensation to participate in this proceeding. That said, I am very appreciative that the commission accepted me as a party to this important proceeding. I feel it is my duty given what my family went through the night of October 8, 2017 to participate and contribute as much as I can to these important issues. Additionally, I feel I have a professional obligation to engage given the urgency of climate change and ongoing wildfire threats. I know that it will take diverse subject matter experts coming together to address these issues on behalf of Californians to identify and drive solutions and strategies. I have appreciated the collaborative work with other parties from diverse perspectives through the workshops and other meetings.</p>	<p>We thank Mr. Abrams for his participation in this proceeding and find that he made a substantial contribution. As explained in greater detail, below, we do not find his proposed rate of \$290 per hour to be reasonable and thus reduce his hourly rate to \$155 per hour.</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>I am seeking compensation for my 232 hours of work on this proceeding which does</p>	<p>With the adjustments made to</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>not include travel expenses. My work on this proceeding includes but is not limited to the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Opening Comments – This was a direct response to the Phase 1 issues 2) Reply Comments – I responded directly to the IOU proposed de-energization/PSPS proposals and made recommendations for changes 3) Comments to Proposed Decision (PD) – I provided recommendations for improvements to the decision and some of these recommendations were incorporated into the Phase 2 scope of the proceeding. 4) Analysis – I conducted detailed analysis of the ESRB-8 and other associated documentation regarding de-energization and the effects on ratepayers, first responders and other stakeholders 5) Meetings – I met with IOU and Non-Utility Parties to Proceeding to collaborate and discuss recommendations <p>I am not claiming compensation on much of my work that has informed my recommendations for these proceedings. During this same period of time, I have been working at the state and local level to develop perspective on these proceedings. I have met with local wildfire survivor groups, nonprofit executives, Fire Chiefs, Fire Marshals as well as Local/State Elected Officials to understand impacts of de-energization. Additionally, I have met with subject matter experts and former colleagues from my work in risk mitigation, quality assurance as well as executives in adjacent industries that have perspectives on these proceedings. My prior work in government, nonprofit and corporate environments provided me contacts and context to provide broad-based recommendations related to many facets of these proceedings.</p> <p>Additionally, I am requesting compensation for 12.0 hours devoted to preparation of this request for compensation. This is a reasonable number of hours for preparing a compensation request of this scope especially given that this is the first time I am preparing this document.</p> <p>Summary: The Commission should find that the number of hours claimed is fully reasonable in light of the scope and complexity of issues addressed in the decisions and the impact I have made in this proceeding.</p>	<p>his hourly rate, we find the hours claimed to be reasonable.</p>
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue: I have provided detailed analysis and recommendations on many issues associated with this proceeding. The following provides a general breakdown of the hours devoted to each category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications/Alerts/Education Strategy and Tactic - (25%) • De-Energization Management and Operational Considerations (Protocols, Policies, Rules and Standards) – (25%) • De-energization Metrics and Methodologies – (20%) • De-energization Impacts for Stakeholders including Ratepayers, First 	<p>We made no changes to this allocation.</p>

	CPUC Discussion
Responders and Vulnerable Populations – (25%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tracking and Reporting De-Energization Events (5%) 	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
William B. Abrams (advocate) ³	2019	232	\$290	D.19-05-042	\$67,280	232	\$155 [1]	\$35,960.00
Subtotal: \$67,280						Subtotal: \$35,960.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
William B. Abrams	2019	12	\$145	D.19-05-042	\$1,740	12	\$77.50	\$930.00
Subtotal: \$1,740						Subtotal: \$930.00		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1.	Travel Expenses	1 Trips from Santa Rosa to Sacramento at \$120/trip			\$120	\$0.00 [2]		
2	Travel Expenses	1 Trip from Santa Rosa to San Francisco CPUC at \$120/trip			\$120	\$0.00 [2]		
Subtotal: \$240						Subtotal: \$0.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$69,260						TOTAL AWARD: \$36,890.00		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained</p>								

³ The original "expert" description for William B. Abrams's role is changed to "advocate." This category is aligned with William B. Abrams's eligibility to claim intervenor compensation as an individual utility customer advocating for himself and similarly situated ratepayers (Section 1802(b)(1)(A)); D.98-04-059 at p. 30)

CLAIMED	CPUC AWARD
for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award. **Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate	

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:
(attachments not attached to final Decision)

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Timesheet
Comment #1	Quoted hourly rate of William B. Abrams is less than ½ his usual hourly rate.
Comment #2	Hours worked with Wildfire Survivor Groups, Nonprofits and Local/State Governmental Organizations and other SME Stakeholders to inform my recommendations in this proceeding were not included in this claim.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Reduction in hourly rate	<p>We thank Mr. Abrams for his participation in this proceeding and find that he made a substantial contribution. However, we do not find his proposed rate of \$290 per hour to be reasonable or consistent with the Commission's general approach to intervenor compensation. The Commission tends to pay advocates like Mr. Abrams (Category 1 customers) less than experts (e.g., See D. 15-04-014). We note that other parties in this proceeding also make this distinction in their compensation claims. For example, the Mussey Grade Road Alliance requests \$305 per hour for its expert, Dr. Mitchell, while it requests \$140 per hour for its advocate, Ms. Conklin.</p> <p>We determined Mr. Abrams' hourly rate taking into consideration his lack of experience appearing before the Commission prior to 2019, the quality and complexity of his pleadings and testimony, as well as his efficiency in preparing his filings. In this proceeding we note that the Mussey Grade Road Alliance claims 8.8 hours to prepare its opening comments on this Order Instituting Rulemaking, which consists of 15 pages, including substantive recommendations, while Mr. Abrams claims eight hours to prepare a four page motion for party status. We use this comparison not to question the hours Mr. Abrams claims for this task, nor to criticize the substance of his contribution, but rather to place a value on that contribution that is consistent with statute and Commission practice. In light of this, it is reasonable to compensate Mr. Abrams at a rate of \$155 per hour, the entry-level rate for intervenor compensation of experts and advocates, instead of the \$290 per hour rate he requests.</p>
[2] Travel claim reduced	The Commission does not reimburse intervenors for trips between locations that are less than 120 miles apart. Santa Rosa is roughly 95 miles from Sacramento and Santa Rosa is

Item	Reason
	roughly 55 miles from San Francisco.
Disposition of William B. Abrams's Motion for Leave to File Under Seal	<p>On August 5, 2019, William B. Abrams, in response to the Ruling of May 21, 2019, filed his personal financial information (see, Part I(C)(9-12), above). William B. Abrams also filed his resumé. The financial documents and resumé were submitted under seal, accompanied by the motion for leave to file under seal (Motion), pursuant to Rule 11.4 of the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure. The Motion is granted.</p> <p>William B. Abrams's personal information consisting of the tax returns and his information consisting of his resumé shall remain under seal and not be made accessible to anyone other than Commission staff, the assigned Commissioner, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) or the ALJ then designated as the Law and Motion Judge.</p> <p>Any party outside the Commission who have a legitimate reason to review William B. Abrams's personal financial information and his resumé shall do so by obtaining it from William B. Abrams through the use of an appropriate nondisclosure agreement or, if an agreement cannot be reached, by filing a motion at the Commission to obtain access to the information under the terms of an appropriate nondisclosure agreement.</p>

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
--	----

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No
--	----

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion
	No comments were filed.	

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. William B. Abrams has made a substantial contribution to D.19-05-042.
2. The requested hourly rates for William B. Abrams, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.

3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$36,890.00.
5. William B. Abrams's personal information filed under seal on August 5, 2019 is confidential in nature.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.
2. William B. Abrams's motion to file under seal filed on August 5, 2019 should be granted.

ORDER

1. William B. Abrams shall be awarded \$36,890.00.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric), Bear Valley Electric Service, a division of Golden State Water Company, and Pacific Power, a division of PacifiCorp, shall pay William B. Abrams their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2019 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is unavailable, the most recent electric revenue data shall be used. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning October 19, 2019, the 75th day after the filing of William B. Abrams' request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. William B. Abrams's motion of August 5, 2019, to file under seal his personal information is granted as set forth.
4. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1905042		
Proceeding(s):	R1812005		
Author:	ALJ Stevens and ALJ Poirier		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric), Bear Valley Electric Service, a division of Golden State Water Company, and Pacific Power, a division of PacifiCorp.		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier ?	Reason Change/Disallowance
William B. Abrams	6/5/19	\$69,260	\$36,890.00	N/A	Hourly rate reduced from \$290 per hour to \$155 per hour and ineligible travel disallowances.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
William	Abrams	Advocate	\$290	2019	\$155

(END OF APPENDIX)

Document comparison by Workshare Compare on Friday, July 31, 2020 2:26:00 PM

Input:	
Document 1 ID	file:///C:/Users/nd3/OneDrive - The CPUC/_CPUC Work/[] R1812005 W.B. Abrams IComp PD (rcvd.2020-05-20)ORIGINAL - R1812005 W.B. Abrams IComp PD.docx
Description	ORIGINAL - R1812005 W.B. Abrams IComp PD
Document 2 ID	file:///C:/Users/nd3/OneDrive - The CPUC/_CPUC Work/[] R1812005 W.B. Abrams IComp PD (rcvd.2020-05-20)MODIFIED - R1812005 W.B. Abrams IComp PD (Rev.1).docx
Description	MODIFIED - R1812005 W.B. Abrams IComp PD (Rev.1)
Rendering set	Standard

Legend:	
<u>Insertion</u>	
Deletion	
Moved from	
<u>Moved to</u>	
Style change	
Format change	
Moved deletion	
Inserted cell	
Deleted cell	
Moved cell	
Split/Merged cell	
Padding cell	

Statistics:	
	Count
Insertions	7
Deletions	20
Moved from	0
Moved to	0
Style change	0

Format changed	0
Total changes	27